Dear Commissioners: I am an amateur radio operator and an electronics engineer, so Ican speak with some authority on the NOI 03-104, Broadband over Power Lines (BPL). I wish to comment on the following:

1. RELAXATION OF PART 15 RULES. Part 15 rules concerning BPL should not be relaxed as the BPL industry is requesting. Even with the field strengths allowed under the rules now, BPL will cause harmful interference to amateur radio operators and other licensed users, because, the device used by BPL to place the BPL signal on the power line is, in fact, a radio transmitter, and the power line then becomes, in fact, a very large unintentional antenna. This has already been documented in comments filed by the american Radio Relay League. I need not repeat them here. If BPL is widely deployed, you can be assured that amateur radio operators who experience interference will not hessitate to file complaints with the FCC. The FCC has promised to protect licensed users of the spectrum from Part 15 interference, and the amateur radio community will hold the FCC to that promise. With that in mind, does the FCC relish the notion of its already understaffed and overworked employees chasing down thousands of BPL complaints? Such a diversion of valuable FCC resources would surely not be in the public interest, and, should BPL be deployed, it is all but assured, given the close proximity of amateur stations to power lines. BPL will also cause amateur stations to operate at higher power levels, so that they can be heard over BPL interference. This would be akin to everyone shouting to make themselves heard, and increase the likelyhood of radio frequency interference for everyone!

2. VALIDITY OF BPL FIELD TESTS. While there have been field trials of BPL, it is reasonable to assume that complaints from the amateur community about the trials have not been as numerous as they could have been, due to the fact that, first of all, the time and dates of the trials have not been widely publicized, denying the amateurs an opportunity to assess the impact of BPL on their operations, and lastly, the amateurs who did suffer interference most likely did not know whom to complain to or what to complain about, again, because they were not informed about the trials nor the nature of the interference resulting therein. I did not find out about the existence of these trials myself until well after the fact. What is needed is a more structured trial method, which gives the amateurs in the target area the opportunity to assess the impact upon their operations. Any trial of BPL should include a written notice to all licensed radio users in the trial area, informing them of the times and dates of the trial, so that they will have the opportunity to assess its impact. This was not done in any of the BPL trials so far. Because of that, any claims of a successful BPL trial by the power line communication industry should be disregarded.

3. CHOICE OF BPL OPERATING FREQUENCIES. To avoid the deluge of BPL related complaints to the FCC, which are sure to occur if BPL is deployed, now that the amateur community is being educated about BPL by the American Radio Relay League, and other amateur radio oganizations, BPL should not operate near amateur radio allocations. Again, we, the amateur radio community, will hold the FCC to its mission of protecting licensed users from interference. It should also not operate near any other allocations available to the general public, such as Citizens Radio, Family Radio service, and the like. Operation on or near amateur or citizen's radio frequencies should also be avoided due to the interference that these services could cause to BPL. The devices used to extract the BPL signal from the power line are, in fact, radio recievers, and as such are also subject to interference. An amateur station, operating at the legal limit of 1500 watts into a 10db gain antenna could render a nearby BPL extraction device useless by overloading it. And the amateur station has every right to operate there, under the rules. It would most likely be operating at maximum power too, if the station it is communicating with is also experiencing BPL interference and cannot hear a low power transmission! May I remind the

commission that an amateur request for an allocation in the 136 and 160-190khz ranges was rejected by the FCC because of the potential interference it might cause to power line communications already in use by the utility companies on those frequencies. For the same reason, BPL allocations near amateur frequencies that have existed for decades should also be rejected because they will also be subject to similar interference. Only in this case, it would be both the amateur, and the power line communicator, that would suffer the interference.

Lastly, let me conclude by reminding the Commission of amateur radio's rich history of public serivice in times of need, a service that would be greatly compromised should BPL interfere with our ability to communicate. Do we really want to jeopardize this valuable resource, especially in these post 9-11 times? Thank you for your attention.